tion implies a written source, some book not merely describing the adventures of Bartholomew but written in his name. None of the published fragments provides quite what is needed. Is the unknown source therefore to be identified with the original Gospel of Bartholomew which Wilmart and Tisserant suppose to lie behind all the known apocrypha?

(*b*) If the Cross is the *first* gate it seems to be implied, as Theodosios points out, that there are subsequent gates. Have we here a reminiscence of those Gnostic schemes of redemption in which the gateways leading to the spheres of the various 'archons' are prominent features?

(*c*) When the writer refers to the 'Cross of mysteries', is he thinking of the historical Crucifixion of Christ or of the mystical experience of the soul? In other words, was the Apocryphon here quoted a mystical book like the book of Hierotheos?

It is interesting that of the two earliest known quotations of Bartholomew one occurs in the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, and the other in a book which Theodosios at any rate believed to have been written by the teacher of Dionysius, and that both writers use the epithet 'divine'. It is also noteworthy that the birthplace chosen by Wilmart and Tisserant for their original Gospel of Bartholomew is the kind of place where von Harnack and others suppose the Dionysian literature to have originated (*Hist. of Dogma* iv 337).

F. S. MARSH.

ON THE AFRICAN ORIGIN OF CODEX PALATINUS OF THE GOSPELS (*e*).

IN his lucid and interesting account of the recovery of a lost leaf of Codex Palatinus (*e*) of the Old Latin Gospels Prof. A. Souter raises the question of the origin of the MS and comes to the conclusion that the MS was written in Africa.[1] I think something may be said in support of this view, but the grounds on which Prof. Souter bases his conclusion need examining. Nothing is more important in Latin palaeography than to ascertain the characteristics which distinguish the various schools of writing. The present note is concerned with the question of the African school. Did such a school exist in the fifth and sixth centuries and, if so, what were its distinguishing features?

Whenever there is a suspicion that a given MS may come from Africa it is sound palaeography to resort at once to Codex Bobiensis (*k*) of the

[1] *J. T. S.* xxiii (1922) p. 285.

Downloaded from http://jts.oxfordjournals.org/ at Princeton University on July 13, 2015

Gospels[1] to see if striking similarities are to be observed. For, if any Latin MS of the Bible comes from Africa, Codex *k* is that MS. Not only is the form of its uncial characters 'exotic', as Traube expressed it (taking the Italian uncials as the normal), but the many curious symbols for the 'Nomina Sacra' which abound in *k* are found in no other Latin MS.[2] This in itself renders *k* a provincial product. When to peculiarity of script and of abbreviations we add peculiarity of text the surmise that we are dealing with a provincial product changes to conviction. Now we know that the text of *k* is African. We naturally infer that the script is also. This hypothesis, moreover, receives corroboration from the circumstance that the two MSS which most closely resemble it graphically contain works of an African Father, St Cyprian.[3] The general angularity of curved letters found in *k* is also to be seen in these two MSS of Cyprian. And the peculiarly shaped *m*, with the first stroke a markedly straight line, as in half-uncials, is especially noteworthy. Another characteristic letter is *e* with the tongue rather coarsely drawn, not at all like the *e* of such genuine Italian MSS as the Puteanus of Livy (MS Paris lat. 5730)[4] and the Codex Vercellensis (*a*) of the Gospels,[5] written about the same time as *k* and the Cyprian MSS mentioned. And the stroke indicating omitted *m* or *n* at the end of a line is placed in *k* and the two Cyprian MSS not *after* the vowel, as is usual in Italian MSS of this period, but directly *over* it. If we were right in regarding *k* as of African origin then the similarity between *k* and the two MSS of Cyprian (an African writer) is tantamount to confirmation of the African origin of these two Cyprian MSS also. If this reasoning is correct *k* and the two Cyprian MSS constitute our first touchstone for testing African origin, at least for uncial MSS of about the fifth century.

How does the case stand with regard to the Codex Palatinus? The first point to bear in mind is that it is not as old an uncial MS as either *k* or the two Cyprian MSS. It is perhaps by a century more recent. This may account for the absence in *e* of the peculiar forms found in *k*.

[1] MS Turin G vii 15. For facsimiles see C. Cipolla *Codici Bobbiesi* pl. xiv–xv and the complete reproduction of the MS: *Il codice evangelico* k *della biblioteca universitaria nazionale di Torino* (Turin 1913). Also *Old Latin Biblical Texts* vol. ii (Oxford 1886); and *J. T. S.* v (1903) 88 sqq.

[2] See L. Traube *Nomina Sacra* pp. 138 sqq.

[3] I refer to MS Turin F iv 27 (+ Milan D 519 inf. + Vatic. lat 10959) and the fragment, Orleans 192 (169) fol. 1 reproduced in Chatelain *Uncialis Scriptura* pl V a The Turin MS is reproduced in Chatelain *op. cit* pl. iv, and in Cipolla *Cod Bob.* pl. xiii. Facsimile of the Vatican fragment of the Turin MS in Ehrle-Liebaert *Specimina cod. lat. Vatic.* pl. 5 d.

[4] Facsimiles in Chatelain *Pal. des class. lat.* pl cxvi; *Pal. Soc.* pl. 31, 32; Zangemeister-Wattenbach *Exempla* pl. xix and elsewhere: the entire MS is reproduced on a reduced scale by Béthaud of Paris.

[5] Facsimile in Ehrle-Liebaert *Specimina* pl 5 c.

Downloaded from http://jts.oxfordjournals.org/ at Princeton University on July 13, 2015

But are there no features in *e* which point to Africa as its home? Prof. Souter gives three: '(1) the fact that the initial letter of each column, whether it be at the beginning of a word or not, is always a very large capital; (2) the horizontal stroke beyond the end of a line indicating omitted *m* or *n* is neither a horizontal stroke pure and simple (with or without a . or ,) nor a gracefully curved line (with or without a . or ,), but a horizontal stroke with a short angular hook at each end, thus ; (3) the letter G is not represented by a C with a faint oblique stroke at the foot, but by an additional curl of the lower part of the curve of the C itself.' Let us examine these three features in their order.

(1) If the use of capitals at the beginning of each page or column is an African feature we should find it in *k* and the Cyprian MSS. This is not the case, however. On the other hand, this feature, if it be African, should be absent in non-African MSS. What are the facts? We find capitals at the beginning of each page or each column used regularly in the following MSS:

A. *Classical Works.*

1. Vatic. lat. 3256—Virgil. Square capitals s. iv.
2. Vienna 16[1]—Lucan. Rustic cap. s. iv.
3. Rome Vatic. lat. 10696—Livy. Uncial s. v.
4. Paris lat. 5730[2]—Livy. Uncial s. v.
5. Vienna 15—Livy. Uncial s. v.
6. Vienna 1[a]—Pliny Hist. Nat. Uncial s. v.
7. St Paul in Carinthia XXV 2. 36—Pliny H. N. Uncial s. v.
8. Vienna 1—Ulpianus, Instit. Uncial s. v.
9. Verona XV (13)—Gaius, Instit. Uncial s. v.
10. New York, Morgan MS M 462—Pliny, Epist. Uncial s. v.

B. *Christian Works.*

1. Paris lat. 17725—Gospels (ff[2]). Uncial s. v.
2. Milan Ambros. C 73 inf.—Gospels. Uncial s. v.
3. Vienna 1235[3]—Gospels. Uncial s. v.
4. Verona XXVIII (26)—August. Uncial s. v.
5. Petrograd Q. v. I. 3—August. Uncial s. v.
6. Würzburg th. q. 2—Hieron. Uncial s. v.
7. St Paul in Carinthia XXV 3. 19—Ambros. Uncial s. v.
8. Verona XIII (11)—Hilarius. Uncial s. v.

The above list, it will be seen, includes only the oldest of the Latin

[1] The MS is now in Naples. Facsimiles in *Mon. Pal. Vindob.* ii pl. 27-28.

[2] Only here and there, e.g. fol. 257[v] col. ii begins with a capital though in the middle of a word.

[3] Now in Naples.

Downloaded from http://jts.oxfordjournals.org/ at Princeton University on July 13, 2015

MSS which shew the feature under discussion. No one will venture to claim these MSS for Africa on the strength of this feature. Some of them obviously originated in Italy, with which country their whole past history is bound up. Others are so like them as to justify their being ascribed to Italy

(2) The shape of the *m* or *n* stroke found in *e* is, I fear, no criterion. It is found in Vienna 1235 (now in Naples) and in other MSS that have no connexion with Africa.

(3) The G found in Codex Palatinus is a form taken from Rustic capitals. The scribe of *e* is guilty here of mixing types of writing. It is hard to find another uncial MS with this form of G. It is not found in *k* nor in the two Cyprian MSS referred to above. There is no ground whatever for considering it African.

Although it must be granted that the palaeographical arguments adduced by Prof. Souter do not establish the African theory, there is one external feature which connects the Palatinus with *k* and the Cyprian MSS and thus supports that theory. The feature is sufficiently peculiar to merit attention. I refer to the trick which the scribe of *e* has of writing his letters not on the line or just a little above the line (as is usual with scribes) but partly above and partly below the line, so that the ruled line appears to cut through the lower portion of the letters. This feature is very marked in the Turin Cyprian MS. It is also seen here and there in *k*, and, unless I err, in the Orleans fragment of Cyprian as well. The leaf of the Palatinus examined by me in the British Museum shews the same unusual feature. Now this feature is very rare in Latin MSS, and *e* shares this feature with *k* (the African text of the Gospels) and two MSS of Cyprian, an African writer. It is, of course, possible that this agreement is merely accidental. It is more reasonable, however, to ascribe it to the common African origin of the MSS in question. If the above is correct, our main source of information of African palaeography during the earliest period is to be found in *k* and *e* and the Cyprian MSS mentioned above.

Codex Palatinus of the Gospels was preserved in the eighteenth century in the Bishop's Palace at Trent. For over a century it found a home in the Imperial and Royal Library of Vienna (MS 1185). As a result of the war the precious book is again at Trent.[1] *Habent sua fata libelli.*

E. A. LOWE.

[1] See H. Tietze *Die Entfuhrung von Wiener Kuntswerken nach Italien* (Vienna 1919) pp. 38 and 51.

Downloaded from http://jts.oxfordjournals.org/ at Princeton University on July 13, 2015